

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated May 16, 2011, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-47 and 49-54 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 14, 15, 22, 31, 42, 45 and 49 are amended. Claim 55 is added. No claims are canceled. As a result, claims 1-47 and 49-55 are pending for examination with claims 1, 31 and 49 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-11, 14-23, 27, 31-41, 43-45, 49, 51 and 53-54 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,646,688 (“Hashimoto”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,019 (“Ryan”). While the Applicants believe the claims as previously presented patentably distinguish over the alleged combination, the independent claims are amended herein to expedite allowance of this case.

In particular, each of the independent claims are amended to recite “said second and third signals comprising a decoded video image stream wherein a part of said second signal comprises a picture level parameter word which comprises coding standard information, said coding standard information *indicating which of a plurality of encoding methods was used to encode the encoded video data*” (emphasis added). None of the references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest this limitation.

The Office Action concedes that Hashimoto is silent with respect to “wherein a part of said second signal comprises a picture level parameter word which comprises coding standard information, said coding standard information defining variations in the type of data” (page 4, Office Action). However, the Office Action alleges that Ryan cure these deficiencies. In this respect, the Office Action asserts that Ryan discloses coding standard information defining variations in the type of data in column 5, line 46-52. While Applicants do not agree that the subject matter disclosed therein meets the limitations alleged, the claims are amended to recite “coding standard information *indicating which of a plurality of encoding methods was used to encode the encoded video data*,” as indicated above (emphasis added).

Nowhere does Ryan disclose or suggest that the information that the Office Action alleges is coding standard information, or any other information in Ryan, indicates which of a plurality of encoding methods was used to encode the encoded video data. Indeed, Ryan is directed to decoding video encoded according to the MPEG standard. Ryan nowhere discloses decoding signals that could have been encoded using any one of a plurality of encoding standards or methods, nor does Ryan disclose that the syntax processor is capable of operating on anything but MPEG encoded data. Accordingly, Ryan would appear to have no need for such coding information as the system in Ryan is disclosed only as operating on MPEG encoded data, and such information would therefore be meaningless.

Therefore, nowhere does the alleged combination of Hasimoto and Ryan, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest “said second and third signals comprising a decoded video image stream wherein a part of said second signal comprises a picture level parameter word which comprises coding standard information, said coding standard information indicating which of a plurality of encoding methods was used to encode the encoded video data,” as recited in claims 1, 31 and 49. Therefore, claims 1, 31 and 49 patentably distinguish over the alleged combination and are in allowable condition.

Claims 2-30 and 50-53, and claims 32-47 and 54 depend from claims 1, 31 and 49, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

General Comments on Dependent Claims

Because each of the dependent claims depends from a base claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicants believe that it is unnecessary at this time to argue the further distinguishing features of all of the dependent claims. However, Applicants do not necessarily concur with the interpretation of the dependent claims as set forth in the Office Action, nor do Applicants concur that the basis for the rejection of any of the dependent claims is proper. Therefore, Applicants reserve the right to specifically address in the future the further patentability of the dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number indicated below to discuss any outstanding issues relating to the allowability of the application.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees filed, asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 23/2825, under Docket No. S1022.71096US00 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: August 16, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By: Marc S. Johannes
Marc S. Johannes, Reg. No.: 64,978
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
Tel: 617.646.8000